Application No. 10/639,948 Confirmation No. 6989

SENT BY: M&G;

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request entry of the Amendment and reconsideration of the claims. Claim 1 has been amended. No new matter has been added through the amendment. Claims 1-12 are currently pending. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the pending rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, and 35 U.S.C. §103, and for obviousness-type double patenting.

Examiner's Interview

Applicants thank the Examiner for his time in discussing the pending claims during the recent telephone interview held March 11, 2005. Although no agreement was reached, this reply is submitted in keeping with the comments and discussion of the interview.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112, First Paragraph

The Examiner rejects claims 1 and 4-12 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, for an alleged lack of enablement. The Examiner contends that the scope of the claims is not commensurate with the scope of enablement in the specification. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that the specification does not enable 3-acylated analogues of pyridoxal other than the 3-acylated analogues recited in claims 2 and 3. Applicants traverse.

While not acquiescing to the rejection and in order to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended claim 1. Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite to recite 3-acylated analogues corresponding to claims 2 and 3. Support can be found throughout the specification, including at paragraphs 12-13.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-6, 8-20, 22-25, and 27-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for alleged obviousness. The Examiner asserts that claims 1-6, 8-20, 22-25, and 27-41 are unpatentable over Smith et al. (WO 98/19690) in combination with Lobel (U.S. Patent No. 3,282,778) or with DiPiro. The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three criteria must be met--a suggestion or motivation to combine references, a reasonable expectation of success, and the prior art

Application No. 10/639,948 Confirmation No. 6989

reference teaches or suggests all the claim limitations. MPEP §2143; In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488 (Fed. Cir. 1991). The Examiner has not established a prima facie case of obviousness since there is not expectation of success for the claimed combination.

A. Smith in view of DiPiro

The disclosure of Smith et al. in view of DiPiro does not provide an expectation of success. Smith et al. do not disclose the use of pyridoxal-5'-phosphate, pyridoxal, pyridoxamine, or any 3-acylated analogue of pyridoxal in the indicated therapy. Only vitamin B₆ and other compounds non-relevant to the present invention are used in Smith et al. Although pyridoxal-5'-phosphate, pyridoxal, pyridoxamine and 3-acylated analogues of pyridoxal are derivatives of vitamin B₆ (pyridoxine), they are different compounds, with chemical structures and metabolic properties distinct from vitamin B₆. In addition, there is no suggestion in the disclosure of this reference that vitamin B₆ derivatives were contemplated. Indeed, reference is made to "folic acid or a folate or a derivative thereof or betaine or vitamin B₆ or a combination thereof, above, or optionally with vitamin B₁₂,...". See page 5, lines 9-12. In the case of folic acid or a folate where derivatives thereof are contemplated, a list of such derivatives is specifically disclosed. See page 7, lines 1 through 9. This list does not disclose any compounds of the instant application.

Further, vitamin B₆ (pyridoxine) is not pharmaceutically equivalent to the active metabolites. Although there are metabolic pathways from all of the vitamin B₆ precursors to pyridoxal-5'-phosphate, the metabolically active form of the vitamin is not equivalent. For example, the administration of pyridoxine results in high plasma levels of pyridoxine, which can lead to toxic effects such as peripheral neuropathy (Schaumburg et al., New England J Med 1983, 309, 445-448). Pyridoxal phosphate itself is less effective than pyridoxal in reducing ischemia induced neuronal damage (Yamashima et al., Nutr. Neurosci. 2001, 4(5), 389-397). Pyridoxamine specifically inhibits the formation of advanced end glycation products, which contribute to the chemical modification of proteins during aging and diabetes (Onorato et al., J. Biol. Chem., 2000, 275(28), 21177-21784). Pyridoxal-5'-phosphate has been found to alleviate epileptic seizures which do not respond to treatment with pyridoxine (Kuo and Wang, Pediatr. Neurol., 2002, 26(2), 146-7). Since Vitamin B₆ is not pharmaceutically equivalent to the active

Application No. 10/639,948 Confirmation No. 6989

SENT BY: M&G;

metabolites in the instant application, the cited references have not suggested all of the claim limitations.

Additionally, there is no motivation to combine the DiPiro reference with Smith et al.

The DiPiro reference provides an overview of congestive heart failure and teaches that congestive heart failure can be the result of many causes including hypertension and vasoconstriction. "Hypertrophy of the ventricle may produce dramatic changes in compliance, even though each individual muscle unit may have relatively normal passive length-tension relations." DiPiro does not disclose the use of pyridoxal-5'-phosphate, pyridoxal, pyridoxamine, or any 3-acylated analogue of pyridoxal in the treatment of congestive heart failure or hypertrophy. In fact, the DiPiro reference teaches away from the instant application. Table 11.3 lists "drugs that may exacerbate or precipitate congestive heart failure." Included in this list are β-blockers (propranolol and others) and calcium channel blockers (verapamil and others). Applicants respectfully assert that the combination of Smith et al. and DiPiro would only result from hindsight reconstruction. In re Oetiker, 977 F.2d 1443, 1447 (Fcd. Cir. 1992). There is no motivation to combine Smith et al. with DiPiro.

B. Smith in view of Lobel

The disclosure of Smith et al. in view of Lobel does not provide an expectation of success. The teachings of Lobel relate to medical preparations for the administration of medicines via oral and parenteral routes, which comprise among other substances, a non-toxic pyridoxine compound. Lobel only presents evidence relating to combining aspirin with a pyridoxine compound for the treatment of colds and combining fluoride with a pyridoxine compound for the treatment of dental carries. Lobel, at best, only provides speculation on the therapeutic advantage of combining a cardiovascular drug with a pyridoxine compound. Lobel does not attribute any medicinal value to pyridoxine derivatives; they simply act as a vehicle to increase the rate of absorption of actual drug. Applicants are the first to show medicinal value from treatment with pyridoxal-5'-phosphate. Therefore, Applicants demonstrate unexpected results over the teaching of Lobel. Further, the combination of pyridoxal-5'-phosphate in combination with other hypertensive agents is a novel treatment method. Applicants respectfully request removal of this rejection.

SENT BY: M&G; 2026258381; MAR-22-05 3:01PM; PAGE 9/11

Application No. 10/639,948 Confirmation No. 6989

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Obviousness-Type Double Patenting Rejections

The Examiner has raised an obviousness-type double patenting objection in relation to claims 1 and 46-48 of US 6,339,085 of Haque. The Examiner has also raised a provisional obviousness-type double patenting objection in relation to claims 1-12 and 40-42 of co-pending applicant's Application Serial No. 09/863,093. While not acquiescing to the rejections and in order to expedite prosecution, Applicants submit a terminal disclaimer to obviate the obviousness-type double patenting rejections. Applicants respectfully request removal of the obviousness-type double patenting rejections.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C. P.O. Box 2903 Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903

Vergrend.

(202)-925-8380

Date: March 22-2005

Reg. No. 25,968

RDaignault:BRD:mls